



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,562	07/11/2006	Pierpaolo Renzo Rottondi	3687-170	5971
23117	7590	11/14/2008	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			DOAN, ROBYN KIEU	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			3732	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/14/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/580,562	Applicant(s) ROTTONDI, PIERPAOLO RENZO
	Examiner Robyn Doan	Art Unit 3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 9-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/8/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cupp in view of Harrison (USP 6,561,197).

With regard to claims 9-12, 14-18, 20, Cupp discloses an auxiliary fitting (figs. 1-4) comprising a support being a hair band (11) and a plurality of artificial locks (14) being connectable to the support, at least one of the locks being removably fastened to the support by a non permanent fixing means (17), one of the two locks being fixed to a male band of hook and loop fasteners and the support being integrally provided with at least one female band of the hook and loop fasteners (see fig. 3 and col. 2, lines 61-65); at least two different locks (14, 16) being fastened to the support such as to be

simultaneously and also being arranged on opposite sides relative to the midline of the support (see fig. 1). Cupp fails to show the at least two locks having different color hairstyles from each other. Harrison discloses a hair integration system (figs. 4 and 5) comprising different color hairstyles attached to the device (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the locks of Cupp with the teaching of using different color hairstyles in order to provide a more natural effect to the hair of the user. In regard to claims 13 and 19, It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ any other material for the artificial hair, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Claims 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice (U.S. Pat. # 5,493,735) in view of Harrison (USP 6,561,197).

With regard to claims 9-20, Rice discloses an auxiliary fitting that can be removably worn by a person (figs. 1-3) comprising a support defining a wig cap (13) and a plurality of artificial or natural (col. 4, lines 14-17) locks (35, 37, 39, 41) being connectable to the support, at least one of the locks being removably fastened to the support by a non permanent fixing means (47), one of the two locks being fixed to a male band of hook and loop fasteners and the support being integrally provided with at least one female band (49) of the hook and loop fasteners (col. 3, lines 45-54); at least

Art Unit: 3732

two different locks (35, 37, 39, 41) being fastened to the support such as to be simultaneously and also being arranged on opposite sides relative to the midline of the support (see fig. 1). Rice fails to show the at least two locks having different color hairstyles from each other. Harrison discloses a hair integration system (figs. 4 and 5) comprising different color hairstyles attached to the device (col. 5, lines 55-67 and col. 6, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the locks of Rice with the teaching of using different color hairstyles in order to provide a more natural effect to the hair of the user.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robyn Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robyn Doan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3732